

*Left out time to read  
all - begin at  
page 7*

# IMMIGRATION

---

---



SHALL IT BE RESTRICTED?  
IF SO, UPON WHAT BASIS?

---

---

READ BEFORE THE "CENTURY CLUB" OF  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, JAN. 31, 1902.

BY MRS. JOHN B. ALLEN.





# IMMIGRATION.

SHALL IT BE RESTRICTED?

IF SO, UPON WHAT BASIS?

READ BEFORE THE "CENTURY CLUB" OF SEATTLE,  
WASHINGTON, JANUARY 31, 1902.

By MRS. JOHN B. ALLEN.

Our forefathers, fleeing from political and religious oppression, declaring that all men were born free and equal, in the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness, have heartily welcomed to this land of the free and home of the brave, all who chose to make this their home, no matter of what nationality, or of what degree of intelligence or prosperity—the indigent and ignorant were as welcome as the prosperous and cultivated. All who would swear allegiance to the laws and constitution of the United States were given an equal status, and a voice in the government and a place in its councils.

America has been the asylum of the poor—the discontented—the unfortunate—as well as the rich, the prosperous and the cultivated. All were given the greatest liberty, and freedom of speech and of action. No one questioned of their past or asked of their future intentions. Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholics, Atheist and Polygamist were equally welcome.

The stranger who wished only to sojourn for a time, and not renounce his allegiance to his mother country, came and went without restrictions or any police regulations. In many states a simple declaration of intention to become a citizen enables a man to cast his vote at municipal and state elections, and his ballot was received as readily as those statesmen who were native born, and versed in constitutional law.

Up to 1875, the exclusion of immigrants was confined to idiots, insane persons and paupers. Our penal and reformatory institutions were being crowded with criminals. Our insane asylums with those mentally unbalanced. Utah was being populated with polygamists gathered from European cities—houses of prostitution replenished by recruits from the immigrant class, our charitable institutions overburdened with care of the indigent and helpless poor. After a strong and determined effort, the class of rejected immigrants was enlarged to exclude, idiots, insane, paupers, those under sentence for crime other than political, or growing out of political offenses, and women imported for purposes of prostitution.

Although it was very evident that the United States was not only acquiring a vast army of the willing and industrious, yet through their lack of intelligence and means of support, were helpless to care for themselves—but were also being made the dumping ground of the thoroughly incompetent, as well as vicious and mentally incapacitated.

All efforts to restrict immigration seemed abortive. The fundamental principle that this was the home for the poor, helpless and down-trodden, was so well established that any amendment seemed to arouse the opposition of those who could point to similar examples of those who had risen above their environments, and shaking off their shackles, had proven to be able, competent and honored.

Notwithstanding all recognized the danger—could see the evils resulting from this promiscuous immigration, but little was chang-

IV 6509  
1902

ed in the statutes, on this subject, until the organization of labor was strong enough to demand that the general custom of contractors and corporations, bringing in immigrants as a body "under contract for labor" should cease, and in 1882 the Exclusion of Chinese was enacted, and in 1885 an act was passed, making it unlawful for any person or corporation, to prepay the passage of any immigrants under any contract "parol or special," "express or implied," made previous to the importation—making only the exception, for foreigners to bring their secretaries or servants; and skilled artisans who might be needed to inaugurate a new industry. The other amendments noted are for the organization of a Commissioner of Immigration, and to grant authority and assign rules for his guidance. The one notable amendment was the granting of authority for the Commissioner of Immigration to contract with State Boards of Charity, to care for the helpless and indigent upon arrival, recognizing the fact that State or National aid was needed, so numerous were these classes. About this time also was enacted the law to oblige steamship companies to export those refused admission, without charge to the immigrant or to the U. S. These vast hordes flocking to this country, who were entirely unfit for self-support or for citizenship, made our statesmen seek diligently for a remedy, and some restriction, which would eliminate the most objectionable. It was apparent then as now that the political agitation of Europe and attempted punishment of such offenders, were throwing into our body politic large numbers of political refugees—Anarchists, Socialists and Nihilists, who found this country not only a safe asylum, but a fertile soil for propagandizing their peculiar dectrines and beliefs. Our lax laws enabled them to organize, educate and graduate from the malcontents the illiterate and the lawless, an army with no regard for our institutions often in open defiance of our laws, even to plot for the overthrow of official authority. Our statesmen recognized an equal danger to our republican institutions from the **over-educated**, the extreme philosopher, the advanced free-thinker, as from the illiterate, the profligate and the idle ne'er-do-well. These elements congregated in our large cities and populated what Ballington Booth has so graphically described in "Darker New York." They struggled with the question, each session of congress, trying to evolve some restrictions that would eliminate, at least some of the objectionable elements that were pouring into this country, but beyond a more specific declaration of the powers, and modis operandi of the Commissioner of Immigration, and holding the transportation companies to greater responsibility, giving the Secretary of the Treasury almost the powers of the Czar, nothing was evolved. Such statesmen as Senators Hale, Hoar, Hill, Washburn, Quay and Lodge and Representatives McMillan, Milliken, McCreary, Owen, Wm. A. Stone, Bertholdt introduced bills giving their best ability to their construction and advocacy, to at least restrict the worst and most dangerous elements, to find them defeated.

It would weary you to do more than glance at a few of the more important attempts—those which come the nearest to being enacted into law especially directed to the exclusion of Anarchists.

In 1888 Representative Adams, of Chicago, soon after the country had been shocked by the Haymarket riot, introduced a bill for the removal of dangerous aliens from the territories of the United States. This did not go farther than the records of the House. Senator Mitchell, the following year, 1889, introduced a bill "To Prohibit Objectionable Foreign Immigration, Encourage Desirable Immigration, Defend American Institutions, Encourage American Labor." One can scarcely understand how there could be considered anything objectionable in such a bill, but it was violently attacked and died aborning. The subject was considered so important that both

Senate and House appointed special committees on immigration, composed of their ablest members. These committees held joint sessions in the intervals of congress, and framed the result of such investigations into a mild restriction act, which invariably was defeated. In 1891 Mr. Oakes introduced a bill "prohibiting from landing in the United States Idiots, Insane, Paupers, Persons Liable to Become Public Charge, Persons Who Had Been Convicted of Felony, or Other Infamous Crime, Polygamists and Anarchists." But, although ably championed, when finally enacted, the word "anarchist" was dropped. Those determined to rid the country of this dangerous element, kept bravely renewing the effort, and Senator Chandler, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Immigration, in 1893 proposed a bill which as one restriction, excluded "Persons belonging to Societies which favor or justify the unlawful destruction of property or life." This, like the other, failed to pass. The bill which excluding Anarchists came the nearest to becoming a law, was framed by Senator David B. Hill, of New York, who was then (in 1893) Chairman of the Senate Committee of Immigration. This bill was endorsed and revised by the Hon. John G. Carlyle, Secretary of the Treasury, one of our ablest Constitutional lawyers and Secretary Olney of the State Department, another constitutional lawyer of national repute. President Carnot, of France, had been assassinated. The revulsion had placed restriction of immigration in the platforms of both parties. The select committee of both houses, after exhausting investigation, had reported unanimously in favor of exclusion of Anarchists. The bill providing that "no alien-Anarchist shall hereafter be permitted to land at any port in the United States or be admitted into the United States, but this shall not be construed so as to apply to political refugees or political offenders." This passed both houses with slight variations which threw it into a Conference Committee and it came back promptly for final passage. Senator Sherman insisted that not only should alien-Anarchists be prohibited from landing, but those persons should be deported who were not of good moral character, that were not attached to the principles of our government and were not disposed to the peace and good order of Society." But Senator Hill urged that the committee did not attempt at this time to legislate against any naturalized citizen, and mentioned the fact, of which the government had received official notice, that a large body of Anarchists, 500 or more, were preparing to immigrate to this country, and it was very desirable to secure this legislation in time to prevent their landing. When the bill having almost unanimously passed the Senate reached the house, objection was made by the Hon. John DeWitt Warner of New York, that there was no definition of "anarchist" in the bill. The debate over this question was as long and exciting as some discussions in our Women's Clubs, and you may find it interesting to follow it in detail. Suffice to say, the discussion was so prolonged, no one being able to offer an amendment embodying a satisfactory definition of Anarchist, the bill failed of passage, notwithstanding the strong popular sentiment that there was imminent danger from those organized foes to our republican institutions. Fearing we may be equally unsuccessful in defining the word "anarchist," I will give you the definition of Representative Wm. A. Stone of Pennsylvania. "That any person who shall belong to, or who shall be appointed, designated, or employed by any Society or Organization existing in this or any foreign country, which provides in writing or by verbal agreement, understanding or countenance, for the taking of human life unlawfully, or for the unlawful destruction of buildings or other property, where the loss of life would be the probable destruction of said property, will be deemed an An-

archist." Senator Hill's definition was: "An Anarchist \* \* \* does not believe in any civil government whatever\* \* \* he believes in no form of civil or social government,—is a disturber of the peace of society. He believes in social chaos; he believes in having no government whatever with which to guide humanity." Senator Hoar expressed the opinion of the wisest and ablest statesmen of our congress and country when he said: "We have the absolute right to exclude persons of other countries from coming here, and we have a right to put upon **them** the burden of showing their fitness, not merely in the light of their past conduct, but their fitness, judging them by their purpose, judging them by their opinions, judging them by the nature of their pursuits and thoughts, and the burden of showing that they come with safety and benefit to the country to which they come." "The Supreme Court has held that every sovereign nation has the power as inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its domain, or to admit them only upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe." (See case Nickimura Ekin vs. United States and Charles A. Carter.) This battle royal against the over-educated alien was during 1893, and was followed by an equally famous contest known as the Lodge Bill, which was conducted during the Congress of 1894, and failing of passage was renewed in the Congress of 1896, and finally carried through by an overwhelming majority. The statistics show an overwhelming overflow and influx of illiterates, and those entirely unable to provide for themselves. The hard times from 1893 to 1897 had carried such wholesale depression of industry, as to create an army of unemployed, that were clamoring through their Labor Organizations, for restriction of immigration, and pouring their petitions and demands upon their representatives. The popular form of petition was to limit the annual immigration to 50,000. It was well known that aliens were coming across the borders for temporary employment, on our public works as well as in private enterprises, and that those who came from Europe to work for a season without being naturalized, and returned to their native country at the close of the season were termed "Birds of Passage." These aliens found it less expensive living in Europe, so leaving their families, returned at the close of the season with their wages, to remain during the winter, to come again the next season to repeat the experiment, never intending to become citizens or permanently remain in this country, and continued so doing until many were well known to the immigration officers. The number of these birds of passage had increased until it was estimated that 11,000 had returned in one year (1895) and transportation companies estimated that fifty per cent of foreigners coming to this country returned at the close of the season. When the immigration was largely from the British Isles, Norway and Sweden, Germany and France, the percentage of illiteracy and "Birds of Passage" had been low, but with the increase of immigration from southern and southeastern Europe the ratio of illiterates had largely increased, and still more so with the ration of the "Birds of Passage." The report of the Commissioner of Immigration for 1897 showed the number of immigrants 263,709, number of illiterates 66,314. Percentage of illiterates from Scandinavian states of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, 1 per cent; Germany less than 3 per cent; England about 5 per cent; Ireland, 7 per cent and Southern and Southeastern Europe over 60 per cent. The report of 1901 gives number of immigrants 487,918, number of illiterates 117,587. I have not been able to secure the data for all the years, showing a proportion of illiterates,

but find this table showing the immigration for each year from 1856 to 1901:

Period.	Immigrants.	Period.	Immigrants.
1856.....	195,857	1879.....	177,826
1857.....	245,945	1880.....	457,257
1858.....	119,501	1881.....	669,431
1859.....	118,616	1882.....	788,992
1860.....	150,237	1883.....	603,322
1861.....	89,724	1884.....	518,592
1862.....	89,007	1885.....	395,346
1863.....	174,524	1886.....	334,203
1864.....	193,195	1887.....	490,109
1865.....	247,453	1888.....	546,889
1866.....	314,917	1889.....	444,427
1867.....	310,965	1890.....	455,302
1868.....	138,840	1891.....	560,319
1869.....	352,768	1892.....	479,663
1870.....	387,203	1893.....	439,730
1871.....	321,350	1894.....	285,631
1872.....	404,806	1895.....	258,536
1873.....	459,803	1896.....	243,267
1874.....	313,339	1897.....	230,832
1875.....	227,498	1898.....	229,299
1876.....	169,986	1899.....	311,715
1877.....	141,857	1900.....	448,572
1878.....	138,469	1901.....	487,018

When one understands that the average annual immigration from 1885 to 1895 have been 435,085, that these ratios of illiteracy were increasing and the "Birds of Passage" were absorbing our wealth and transporting it, adding nothing but their labor to our common wealth, one can readily understand how our citizen labor condemned the present laws. All were for restriction of immigration, but the Herculean task of framing a law that would be of benefit, and not injury, was undertaken by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, assisted by the ablest minds of the Senate and House, and finally the simplest restrictions only were engrossed in the bill, "excluding all persons physically able and over 16 years of age who cannot read or write the English language, or some other language, and excepted the parents and grand parents, wife and minor children, of one qualified to enter who would vouch for them and their support."

"Also making it unlawful for any male alien who has not in good faith made his declaration to become a citizen of the United States, to be employed on any public work of the United States, or to come regularly and habitually into the United States, by land or water, for the purpose of engaging in any mechanical trade, or manual labor for wages or salary, and returning from time to time to a foreign country." Another section making it "unlawful for any person, partnership, company or corporation to employ such aliens." One needs to follow the debate extending over weeks and even months of these years from 1894 to 1897 to realize how difficult it is to frame a law to no part of which someone of 400 representatives will not object. All agreed the immigration laws were too elastic, that we as a commonwealth were being imposed upon by an undesirable class of immigrants, but very few wished to restrict immigration entirely, but no one was willing to acknowledge he did not wish any restriction beyond the present law. So they threshed the question of "Who is an anarchist?" With the hundreds of thousands of acres left still untilled, with the great possibilities of growth of industry, of mining, of manifold arts and trades, but few would say we could not receive and care for many millions of sober, intelligent, industrious immigrants, and that with the return of prosperous times

we would not need them. This bill finally passed by a large majority, and went to the president, Grover Cleveland, who vetoed it. As a unique specimen of reasoning I would recommend you to read the whole message, but I will only quote a paragraph:

"In my opinion it is infinitely more safe to admit an hundred thousand immigrants who, though unable to read or write \* \* \* \* than one of those unruly agitators and enemies of governmental control who can not only read and write but delight in arousing by inflammatory speech the illiterate. Violence and disorder do not originate with illiterate laborers. They are rather the **victims** of the **educated agitator**."

If one is going to handle dynamite, he does not accumulate inflammable material. Inasmuch as we already have illiterates—in the large masses—ready for the educated agitator, it would seem unwise to the ordinary mind to add to the inflammable material. He thought "great injustice might be done the **brothers** and **sisters** of the capable immigrant if they could not be admitted with the illiterate parents and grandparents—wives and children—ignoring the fact that a person of ordinary intelligence, between sixteen and forty-five years of age, could qualify themselves in three months to enter, without leaning on the ability of the fortunate immigrant, who could read and write twenty-five words of our Constitution.

He thought it a dangerous precedent for the country of nations to declare it "a crime for an alien to come regularly and habitually into the United States to obtain work from private parties, if such alien returns from time to time to a foreign country, and to constitute such employment a crime."

So the long struggle of those who saw the abuses—recognized the danger—and framed the mildest restriction possible, was ended—and we have continued to receive the thousands annually—only eliminating idiots, insane, paupers, or those likely to be a public charge—persons suffering from a contagious disease—persons who have been convicted of felony—polygamists, and contract laborers—especially stating that this shall not exclude persons convicted of a political offense—**notwithstanding said political offense may be designated, as a felony, crime, infamous crime or misdemeanor, involving moral turpitude by the laws of the land, from whence he came or by the court convicting.**

We have gone on receiving and welcoming—even sitting idly by while such sentiments as this were promulgated by the press and from platform:

(This was uttered at a public gathering at Cooper's Union, New York City, on March 17, 1890, at a gathering to celebrate the anniversary of the Paris Commune.)

"I look forward with a great deal of joy and satisfaction in the hope that ere long the scenes that were enacted in Paris will be enacted in New York, and that the streets of New York will be covered with dead bodies and the gutters will flow with blood and the houses will be a burning mass."

We have sat patiently and idly by while the educated agitators, have instilled their diabolical principles, into the receptive masses, and then stood aghast when our beloved President was shot down when extending his hand to his assassin. Shall immigration be restricted? Shall anarchists be convicted or deported? Who is an anarchist? are living questions of today, and members of Congress vie with each other to see who can introduce the most extreme measure. While others more calm and conservative remember that this is a government for freedom of speech and a free press, by a free people and will endeavor to curtail the license which is abused, not imperil the liberty of thought and action, so necessary in a Republic.

We will watch the discussion with interest, and see from all this righteous indignation what shall be evolved.

It is well for us of the Pacific Coast, to study even with laborious detail the liberal laws and generous execution of them in admitting to the Atlantic seaports the poor, the downtrodden, the oppressed of Europe without regard to their intellectual attainments, their religious belief or their political heresies—and then turn to refresh our memories with the history of immigration to the Pacific Coast from the Asiatic countries.

We find in China, a country which in morals, literature, vastness of empire, wealth of production, ability to be self supporting, has a history which equals that of any nation. We know and understand so little of it that an endowment fund of \$100,000 has been set aside by one of our eastern colleges to found a chair for the study of China.

So self-sufficient were they, that they resisted with all the resources at their command, the encroachments of other nations. They wished no comity of nations; they wished no commercial relations; no merchants—exchange, no missionaries. They produced for their 400,000,000 all they thought they needed. Confucius' teaching was good enough for them, and they wished no missionaries to tell them of the Christ. Building the great wall to keep out the robbers from the west, they resisted successfully for centuries any invasion of importance from the sea.

England was the first to gain any foothold, and commercial aggrandizement was her motive. As early as 1839, she forced her trade in opium upon the Chinese by the force of arms.

Securing more foothold she was engaged in a second subjugation from 1856 to 1860. The United States sent the Hon. Caleb Cushing as a friendly ambassador to negotiate terms of peace between China and England, and he was followed by the Hon. Wm. B. Reed, and he by the Hon. Anson Burlingame, in 1861. So diplomatic was the latter that he succeeded in winning the confidence of the Chinese government, and effected many treaties, enlarging the commercial relations not only with the United States but other nations.

When in 1867 he was about to return to the United States he was urged to head a delegation of ambassadors to perfect a treaty with the United States and to place China on a basis of friendly relations. So successful was he that the treaty known as the Burlingame treaty was enacted and we were placed under as formal a compact of friendly relations with China as with any other nation. The treaty declared that "the United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects for the purposes of curiosity, of trade or as permanent residents" and added—the "high contracting parties therefore join in reprobating any other than a voluntary emigration for these purposes."

The effectual separation of the Pacific Coast, from the settled parts of the United States, and the seat of government, during the Civil War, had caused not only much inconvenience but uneasiness, and when the war was closed the interest of Congress was easily obtained, to granting a generous subsidy to those who had planned the Union & Central Pacific railroad, thus connecting the Pacific with the Atlantic Coast. There was no difficulty in procuring labor to build to the Rocky mountains, but the population on the Pacific Coast was so limited, transportation so expensive and opportunity for advancement of labor so great on the Atlantic sea coast that the work of building the western end was delayed and seemed impossible.

By this time the commercial relations with China had been so

established that Messrs. Huntington, Crocker and Stanford succeeded in inducing the Chinese companies to bring them laborers from China. Naturally they were from the lowest element—the poorest, most servile class. The well to do, the higher classes did not care to leave home. They were well satisfied in every respect, so that except a very few merchants and managers, our Chinese immigration was of the lowest order in China. They came for the monetary interest. Their love of country, was such they wanted to go back, expected to go back, and would not come in those early days under any agreement except that they should, dead or alive, go back.

We gave them less than ten years to get acquainted—to overcome the prejudice of centuries, or to learn of our Republican government, or grow any affection for us that would induce them to make their home with us.

California, so rich with natural resources of mountain, lake and river, of soil and climate, needing only a population sober and industrious, welcoming the native son of every other clime, no matter how illiterate or lazy, began to cultivate an intolerance to the quiet, patient, sober, industrious Chinaman that cannot be **understood** by any **unprejudiced rational** person, and is today excused by no one. The laws of California, against the Chinese during the years 1870 to 1880 are a disgrace and a burning shame to a civilized nation. They forbade their ever being naturalized. Well, as they never had known the ecstasy of casting a ballot, they did not demur, they would rather be citizens of China, than the United States. They prohibited them from owning a **foot of land** in city or country, mine or farm, not even enough to build a house on or raise a garden. So the wealthy landlord looks to it that John Chinaman pays the highest rents of the Pacific Coast for the poorest accommodations.

The United States in those years gave a homestead, a pre-emption claim, a timber culture claim, perhaps, if managed well, all three to each peasant of Europe who would come here and reside and do very little else, and sometimes not much of **that** on these claims.

California establishes a wise and beneficent public school system for all children, no matter what nationality. She prohibits the Chinese youth from attending her public schools.

The United States Congress cannot secure a law shutting out the illiterates, who cannot read or write the English or any other known language. You never saw a Chinese coolie on American soil, who could not read and write his own language when he arrived, and was so anxious to learn English that he would take his evenings after his twelve to fourteen hours of daily labor to go to school, and pay from his small wages, the philanthropic mission teacher, a high tuition to spend an hour or two teaching him.

No European immigrant was ever instructed how he should dress, cut his hair or his clothes, but California laws proposed to cut every Chinaman's hair short, because they knew that it was an insignia of their loyalty to their religion, and to their country to wear a queue. We who had for years forced our religious missionaries into China to preach the teachings of the meek and lowly Jesus, allowed our hoodlums and sandlotters with impunity, to beat and abuse the "Heathen Chinese" upon any occasion when mischievousness, or viciousness desired.

We well remember the assault in a neighboring city of our own state, where the Chinese without notice or warning, even sufficient to return the clothes from their laundries, gather their belongings or collect their debts, were driven en masse, out miles from town onto an open prairie without food or shelter, huddled in a drenching rain

storm, guarded by this lawless mob. One man who acted as guard drove the cook from his kitchen, and left for several days his wife with a three days old infant to cook her own meals or starve. We well remember how the best citizens of this city stood guard for days as a "posse comitatus" to assist the courts, to protect the Chinese subjects from mob violence; how some of our society women, kept a revolver within reach of her hand, day and night for the days her husband acted as special policeman, to protect her cook from any attempt, of the sandlotter, to frighten him away. The courts were upheld, but the governor had to put the city under martial law for several weeks. To be sure the United States had to pay \$15,000,000 indemnity for this little play spell, because the treaty with China declares that her "citizens shall be accorded the same privileges as those of the most favored nation;" but as long as it was not taxed to Seattle and Tacoma, it made but little impression.

In 1879, about ten years after the Burlingame treaty, when we could count scarcely 100,000 Chinese in the country, with the commercial relations scarcely established, with the Pacific Coast looking to the Occident for its commerce, with every industry needing the patient labor, with millions of tillable land uncultivated, with mountains full of mines, with forests uncut, waters teeming with fish, with households without servants, and transportation companies asking \$100 to transport an European immigrant from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the first exclusion law was passed, without any notice to the other contracting nation, against all comity of nations or law of treaties, by a vote of ayes 155, noes 72 in the House, and by ayes 39, noes 27, in the Senate. We are pleased to notice such names as Roscoe Conkling, Geo. F. Hoar and Stanley Mathews leading the opposition, and we grieve to see James G. Blaine and John H. Mitchell of Oregon advocating the measure.

I would like to follow some of his reasoning, it sounds so strange from a statesman as broad and liberal, as wise and practical as James G. Blaine.

1st. The fear that the Pacific Coast would be overrun with Mongolians, to the exclusion of Americans, because China had 400,000,000 population. They had then been coming nearly 30 years and the census showed less than 100,000, an average of between 4000 and 5000 per year. Compare that with the European immigration of an annual average of 435,085.

He compared the European emigrant with his family, owning their own homes, etc.—the laws of the United States as well as California forbade the Chinese to own land. How could they be expected to build houses on rented land.

Did not bring wives and children. Most of those who attempted to bring their wives found them refused admission as being prostitutes.

You will find the idea of home, of family, of relation of children to parent, no more strongly inculcated in any class of foreigners than those of the Chinese. Chinese children first support and **obey** father and mother, not until twenty-one years of age, but as long as their **parents live**.

Every Chinaman who can pay his debts and have \$300 assets, is to be married, even though he live in America, and his father selects his bride, and has her ready for his son, whom nothing will hinder from going to China to be married, even though he is allowed but one year to be absent, and runs the risk of being shut out on his return, if his sailing vessel is too slow, and reaches port after the year is expired.

Mr. Blaine disclosed himself as opposed to Chinese coming here; opposed to making them citizens; opposed to making them voters,

then declares he is opposed to having a non voting alien element in the country.

Will not let them own land, cannot expect them to build houses on rented land; allow custom officers to consider every Chinese woman married or single a prostitute, and then point with emphasis to the fact that "there are no peasant cottages inhabited by Chinese and their families."

Then he argues against Chinese cheap labor. Any one living on the Pacific Coast today knows that there is no one who values labor for **what it will bring** in the market more than a Chinaman. While he may work cheaply while he does not know **much how to work**, no one knows better than he how to value his labor when he **has** learned, or better how to hold it up to market value.

If Mr. Blaine had paid from \$20 to \$40 per month for a cook, and had him leave you because he could go on one of Uncle Sam's transports or Revenue Cutters and get \$60 to \$75 per month; he would not call that **cheap** labor I am sure.

Nor if he was a farmer of eastern Washington and must have a **cook** for a threshing crew, and pay \$2.00, \$2.50, and even \$3.00 **per day** for such domestic services. To be sure the Chinaman will do the work of two or three women, but with wheat from \$.25 to \$.50 per bushel it's a heavy tax on the poor rancher.

Then he suggests that you cannot work a man who must have bread and butter, and meat, and would like beer, on the wages of a man who can live on rice.

But **why not rice** as well as **macaroni**?

The exclusion act of 1879, was vetoed by President Hayes, who appointed three commissioners, James B. Angell, President Michigan University, John F. Swift, of California and Wm. Henry Trescott of South Carolina, to visit China and negotiate a restriction treaty, which they did, one covering emigration from China to United States, the other protecting the commercial relations between China and the United States. They had but little difficulty in negotiating this treaty of exclusion for the Chinese government has always been loath to part with her subjects, and wished only to protect the rights of those already here.

Laborers were forbidden entry absolutely, no matter how intelligent or moral, skilled or unskilled, whether could speak English or not, if he could not prove he would **not** labor with his hands, within the period of **one** year.

Provides how those already in the United States can return to China by obtaining a certificate and return to the United States within the period of one year.

This act allows other Chinese subjects, other than laborers, to come upon a certificate from Chinese government, stating whom they are, etc. Upon the face of this act it does not seem so obnoxious, but each session of Congress amused itself amending this act and so burdening it with rules and restrictions that it was well prepared when 1892 came to pass an extension act, for ten years, and leave it so hedged about, that it was nearly as easy for a camel, to pass through the eye of a needle, as a Chinaman to **return** to the United States, no matter how well he spoke English, read and wrote it. It would be laughable if it were not so pitiful.

At first a written certificate, describing the individual was demanded, then his picture must be attached, and now it is proposed to have **four pictures**, and any amount of red tape. Chinese officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for pleasure or curiosity are supposed to enter without trouble, having first secured a certificate from their own government, but the rules and regulations grow more and more complex. A student must be one prepared to enter a **college**. A merchant must never labor with his

hands, or he is subject to deportation. When seeking for a certificate to go to China, expecting to return, he must prove by **two witnesses other than Chinese** that he has a thousand dollars to his credit and has not earned it by labor.

Not long since several hundred Chinese who were en route to Mexico were deported from San Francisco, because the officials feared some might wander back into the United States, and our Mexican border is long and not easily guarded.

An eastern immigrant whose entry is in question, is boarded by the United States or the transportation companies. A poor Chinaman who attempts to enter, even if he can prove he has lived in the United States for twenty-five years and has an ordinary English education, can be imprisoned at **hard labor** for one year and then deported.

A merchant who fails, and needs to do household service to fill his depleted purse, is liable to be imprisoned for a year and deported as being a laborer in the country without a certificate.

A Chinese merchant is supposed to be allowed to bring his wife and minor children, but the burden of proof of marriage is made so heavy that almost any man shrinks from bringing his wife for fear she will be considered a prostitute, branded as such and deported.

A Chinese merchant of Walla Walla, who had done business there for nearly a quarter of a century, went to China and attempted to bring his minor boys into this country to teach them his trade, and educate them to manage his business. He died on board ship, before boat landed at Port Townsend, and the Collector of Customs would not admit these minor children, even though chaperoned by their dead father, although an ex-judge of the Supreme Court, knowing the father, offered to be appointed their guardian, and vouch for their being merchants and **not laborers**.

Our good cooks, who converse fluently in English and understand our laws and government better than three-fourths the foreign **voters** may go to China, get caught on a sailing vessel delayed beyond the year by untoward winds, land in Victoria by paying \$50.00 per capita and write piteous letters in English to their employers to influence the obdurate authorities to allow them to enter and do their cooking, but the decision of the Collector of Customs and Secretary of the Treasury is final, and knows no exceptions, and Madame can do her own cooking.

The Pacific Coast Statesman, impelled by Labor Unions, are a unit for Chinese exclusion. They will see contractors fail for lack of reasonable labor, paying from \$2.50 to \$10.00 per day for eight hours work; mines remain closed for lack of laborers who demand \$2.50 to \$3.50 per day for unskilled labor; railroads hampered and troubled to make repairs and extensions even with **their** facilities for transporting from the Atlantic coast, and still vote to exclude immigration from the Occident.

The possibilities of wealth on this Pacific Coast whose resources have scarcely been begun in its possible development, for lack of labor—not cheap coolie labor, but reasonably intelligent, and at reasonable wages, is incalculable.

And what shall we householders say of our needs, for domestic service? I do not need to illustrate to **you** our necessities or sufferings from the lack of not only **competent** service, but often any service, but to have it of record will call your attention to what A. H. Grout, labor commissioner in charge of the free employment bureau of Seattle says in his January, 1902, report on this point.

The one object which causes the most perplexity and worry in the homes of our well-to-do citizens is that of domestic help. Seattle is a young and rapidly growing city at the border of a large

country, and far removed from centers of population, which means that as long as these conditions exist the demand for domestic help will be greater than the supply; and notwithstanding the fact that we endeavored to increase the number of domestics by drawing from the more populous districts of the East, and have been successful to some extent, yet we are daily reminded of the fact that many of our citizens are "still without help."

Our generous husbands, ready to hand the purse to us for domestic uses, still see us pay three times the wages we should for irregular, uncertain, incompetent service, putting up with everything endurable rather than be left to struggle along with the whole problem. We see a larger majority of the wage earners utterly unable to afford a servant, whose wives stagger under the load of household drudgery, much against the husband's wish, but entirely beyond his power to provide even with the high wages of the coast.

It is simply a question of the demand exceeding the supply. At first there was not a perceptible depreciation of servants, then comes lower transportation rates which helped the European immigrants westward, then the Japanese began to come in, and we could breathe a little easier, for while they were ignorant of English or American ways, or household service, still for small wages, they would come and learn and particularly, if they could attend evening school. To be sure they would leave you at an hour's notice if they learned a little, and could get higher wages from your nearest neighbor or closest friend.

But the secretary of the treasury soon issued a circular which exported the little brown men, nearly as fast as they could come.

We have no Japanese restriction law. I suppose the contract labor law must have been stretched to cover this immigration.

The Chinese exclusion Act has been in force nearly twenty years. It cost the government last year \$160,684.67, which in twenty years would amount to the enormous sum of \$3,213,693.40 to say nothing of the expense of courts and officers, of jails where these immigrants have been put at hard labor, pending deportation; nothing of the indirect damages and taxation by lack of their labor.

None of this amount expended for their care, sick or well, was expended to better their condition save to assist a country whose deaths from starvation have exceeded any country on the face of the globe in the past twenty years—simply used to patrol our boundaries—to support an army of Chinese inspectors, and pay necessary expenses—to hunt down and export out of the country the only class of immigrants with no illiterates, no paupers, no beggars and no anarchists among them.

The total immigration of all classes from China from 1885 to 1900, was:

1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893
22	40	10	26	118	1716	2836	....	473.
1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	
1170	539	1441	3363	2071	1660	1247	2459	

And from Japan:

1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901
1380	1931	1150	1110	1526	2230	2844	12635	5247

As a contrast to this let us glance at the record of the Atlantic seaboard for 1901.

Number of immigrants ..... 473,653.  
 Number of illiterates ..... 117,587.  
 Amount expended ..... \$522,602.44  
 not counting \$225,000 for buildings on Ellis island.

Out of this there was expended for care of the sick and helpless \$73,148 in the hospitals at New York. You never heard of a

dollar being expended to care for a sick or needy Chinaman at the public expense in the history of the Pacific coast.

On the other hand the exorbitant wages demanded have obliged householders to secure as much work as possible. A house which should have three servants must do with two, and where two should be employed the income of the family will only allow one, so that discontent and restlessness has grown with the employed, constant change by the employed and consequent inconvenience and annoyance to the employer. A domestic knows if she leaves her place a dozen to fifty places are waiting for her. Without references, she can take her choice of many. Her mistress knows if she loses her she **may** secure another, but the chances are some time will intervene, and she may not be so well served as in the first instance. These conditions consequent, upon a greater demand than supply, have acted and reacted on each other until our condition as housekeepers is certainly deplorable and for the past four years has been steadily growing worse.

The Chinese Exclusion act of 1892 is about to expire, in May, 1902, and the treaty regulating commercial relations with China in 1904. China's ports have been forced open by force of arms. We have witnessed the horrors, resulting from her futile effort of retaliation, to exclude the "foreign devils," and feel proud of our government which stood for peace and justice, and against the evident desire of European powers for the partition of China, and checked their keen aggrandizement.

The commercial interests of the Pacific coast depend largely upon our friendly relations and possible markets in China and Japan, and not only the Pacific coast, but the whole United States. The open door of China will afford manifold opportunities for capital and skilled labor. This intercourse will redound to our interest. It is said the return of our Chinese cooks to China and teaching them the use of flour has increased the export of that commodity alone, millions of dollars annually. Because China is financially weak and humiliated, shall we crowd our civilization and progress upon her, and not allow her to come and learn of us? Shall we not stand before the nations as equally just and liberal to all?

Shall we allow the comment of Wu Ting Fang, minister from China that "when the American people are biased they are beyond argument, and reason does not appeal to them" to stand proven by our re-enacting the ex parte exclusion law against one country and not against all? **None of us object to the restrictions of coolie or contract labor, none of us to the exclusion of illiterates, and if they wish to make the declaration of intention to be naturalized arequisite of admission, very well. But let it apply to the east as well as the west.**

With glaring headlines, in capital type, it was announced in all the prominent Pacific coast papers that President Roosevelt would favor the exclusion of Chinese. Let us listen to what he did say:

#### IMMIGRATION LAWS.

"Our present immigration laws are unsatisfactory. We need every honest and efficient immigrant fitted to become an American citizen, every immigrant who comes here to stay, who brings here a strong body, a stout heart, a good head, and a resolute purpose to do his duty well in every way and to bring up his children as law-abiding and God-fearing members of the community. But there should be a comprehensive law enacted with the object of working a threefold improvement over our present system. First, we should aim to exclude absolutely not only all persons who are known to be believers in anarchistic principles or members of anarchistic societies, but also all persons who are of a low moral tendency or of unsavory reputation. This means that we should require a more

thorough system of inspection abroad and a more rigid system of examination at our immigration ports, the former being especially necessary.

**Should Be Really Intelligent.**

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens. This would not keep out all anarchists, for many of them belong to the intelligent criminal class. But it would do what is also in point, that is, tend to decrease the sum of ignorance, so potent in producing the envy, suspicion, malignant passion, and hatred of order, out of which anarchistic sentiment inevitably spring. Finally, all persons should be excluded who are below a certain standard of economic fitness to enter our industrial field as competitors with American labor. There should be proper proof of personal capacity to earn an American living and enough money to insure a decent start under American conditions. This would stop the influx of cheap labor, and the resulting competition which gives rise to so much of bitterness in American industrial life; and it would dry up the springs of the pestilential social conditions in our great cities, where anarchistic organizations have their greatest possibility of growth.

Both the educational and economic tests in a wise immigration law should be designed to protect and elevate the general body politic and social. A very close supervision should be exercised over the steamship companies which mainly bring over the immigrants, and they should be held to a strict accountability for any infraction of the law."

Where can any one find in this patriotic fearless utterance anything that can be interpreted to exclude the citizens of China and Japan rather than those of Italy or Austria? Can our statesmen not stand on this broad and liberal platform and enact restriction laws, that will eliminate the illiterate and immoral, the vicious and helplessly indigent, and not discriminate against **any** country, but let the hand of welcome be extended to the Occident as to the Orient? Let the Pacific bear the immigrant as well as the Atlantic! Let the only requisites be intelligence, sobriety, morality and industry, obedience to our laws and loyalty to our government. And if they cannot—do not—lay aside bias and prejudice and listen to reason and argument and do re-enact this one country exclusion act, then may God give President Roosevelt the courage of his convictions and nerve his hand to veto the measure!

M. C. ALLEN.

Seattle, January 24, 1902.

# If Restricted, Upon What Basis?

So many women have asked "what can I do?" that I anticipate the question a little by suggesting that this is the question of the hour—now is the time to act—now the time to work.

The Labor Unions everywhere are petitioning for the Chinese Exclusion Act to be re-enacted, and it is proposed to re-enact it in even more stringent terms than it now is, and I have no fear of denouncing it as interpreted by the courts and Secretary of the Treasury—as great a disgrace to our statutes as the Fugitive Slave Act, and we should individually and collectively, as club women, protest against a perpetuation of such an outrage. The Pacific Coast has many clubs—thousands of club women. The representatives of this Congress from the Pacific Coast states are only about thirty, and each one must have an individual influence with one member, and let us exert it with all the ability we have. Then our acquaintance in the east must be more or less, and let us through our clubs, our City and State Federations, wield all the influence possible. We know there are no better domestics than the Chinese and Japanese if well trained and their wages can be brought down to a reasonable price with competition. Let us insist that at **least** those residing here before, shall be allowed to enter again, and the wives and children of these Americanized Chinamen.

Let us not have our substance wasted, our homes suffer, our time and energy, and strength, spent in either struggling along without domestics, or with high priced insolent and inefficient ones, when thousands of competent willing well trained servants stand ready to come and do our bidding.

You ask me do I favor restriction? By all means. Upon what basis? Were I President I'd sign no bill that did not oblige every emigrant, to show his worth and fitness before embarking which could be done by the Consul service of the United States. Eliminate the number of ports to one to three in each country; place men of eminent fitness as Consuls there, and guard well the emigration. Issue no certificates to illiterates, those who have ever been convicted of **any** crime, those who cannot show enough money to buy their passage and support them for at least six months or a year, none who show physical weakness, who would make them liable to be a public charge, or contaminate the health or morals of the community. Admit no anarchists, nihilists or socialists. Oblige a declaration of citizenship upon arrival. Allow no persons

to be naturalized for at **least five** years, and if they do not within one year after the period of probation, become citizens of the United States, be deported. Compel every minor child to attend school, at least six months each year, where **only** English branches are taught. Give naturalization papers to no one who cannot speak, read and write the English language and show a reasonable knowledge of our institutions. Deport or punish every anarchist who through speech or press teaches his anarchistic principles, and lastly restrict the ballot by the same educational test. Make no distinction on line of sex, or color of skin, or shape of **eyebrows**.

Let this Republic stand on intelligence and honesty and honor, or let it fall to decay.

Let a National Board of Immigration be created to work with state boards, to distribute economically the over crowded immigration of the east to the points needing labor, and by securing in advance the employment, have no idle, dependent laborers in one state, with another state suffering for lack of this same labor. An immigrant who has enough to support him for six months, would have enough to transport him to another part of the country, where work could be secured and his employment was assured upon his arrival. It is said that last year during the harvest season, the farmers of Kansas boarded the railroad trains and compelled, by the aid of revolvers, laborers destined for other points, to stop and assist them in saving their crops.

The labor unions are right in asking for national and state aid to disseminate labor to points where industries are suffering for lack of it.

Our free employment bureaus could aid in securing places and when we adopt the European custom of employing no one without a certificate showing ability and trust-worthiness, then we shall have better service and worthy employees, better wages and securer employment.

# How Shall Immigration be Restricted?

## RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas: The expiration of the Chinese Exclusion Act in May, 1903, and the abuses of the present immigration laws, have brought to the attention of Congress the necessity of new legislation; and

Whereas: The Pacific Coast interests have suffered from the lack of intelligent labor, and we as householders, are and have been keen sufferers in the lack of domestic servants, as well as from their inefficiency and unreliability, the demand exceeding the supply; and

Whereas: Lack of good and reliable household service is so prevalent that A. H. Grout, labor commissioner in charge of the free employment bureau at Seattle says in his report of January, 1902:

## DOMESTIC HELP PROBLEM.

The one object which causes the most perplexity and worry in the homes of our well-to-do citizens is that of domestic help. Seattle is a young and rapidly growing city at the border of a large country, and far removed from centers of population, which means that as long as these conditions exist the demand for domestic help will be greater than the supply; and notwithstanding the fact that we endeavored to increase the number of domestics by drawing from the more populous districts of the East, and have been successful to some extent, yet we are daily reminded of the fact that many of our citizens are "still without help." Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we petition our representatives in Congress to work for the amendment, of our immigration laws to restrict the influx of the illiterate and immoral, the vicious and evil-minded, from whatever country, and to admit those, who possess the necessary requisites of "intelligence, sobriety, morality, and industry, who will pledge obedience to our laws and loyalty to our government," and not discriminate against any country or any set of persons.

To create a National Board of Immigration who shall work with and through State Boards of Immigration to distribute the unemployed, from the congested centers, to places whose interests are suffering from lack of their labor, and allow no immigrants to enter, whose means are not sufficient to support them a reasonable length of time, and pay for such additional transportation, as will enable them to reach fields suffering for their labor.

Resolved, That we women of the Pacific Coast earnestly request that at least the Chinese and Japanese, who have lived in the United States, and have been instructed in household and domestic service, having proven themselves competent servants, who have a sufficient knowledge to speak English, as well as read and write their own language, shall not be considered contract or coolie labor, but be allowed to enter the United States and supply the increasing and suffering needs of our domestic service.

That these resolutions be sent to each representative and senator as the expressed wish of the

---

President.

---

Recording Secretary.

# How Shall Immigration be Restricted?

RECEIVED

THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES  
NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 1, 1907

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th inst. in relation to the proposed bill for the restriction of immigration.

I am sorry to hear that the bill has not yet been passed. I am sure that it will be passed in the near future.

## THE PROPOSED BILL

The proposed bill for the restriction of immigration is a very important one. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States.

The proposed bill is a very important one. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States.

The proposed bill is a very important one. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States.

The proposed bill is a very important one. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States.

The proposed bill is a very important one. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States. It is a bill which will have a great effect on the immigration of the United States.

Yours truly,

W. H. H. H.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 866 757 0